DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 798 TM 006 915

AUTHOR Brekke, Milo L.
TITLE Instrumentation to Assess Readiness for Ministry.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (60th, San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Rating Scales; *Clergymen; Cluster Analysis; Criterion Referenced Tests; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Factor Analysis; Higher Education; Interviews; Item Analysis; *Job Skills; *Occupational Tests; Personnel Evaluation; Readiness; *Test Construction; Test Reliability; *Theological Education
IDENTIFIERS Lutherans

ABSTRACT

The Assessment of Readiness for the Professional Practice of Ministry project, sponsored by the Association of Theological Schools, studied methods for determining a person's readiness to enter the ministry and perform effectively. Simultaneously, the Lutheran Seminarian Project assessed the needs and strengths of beginning seminary students. Both projects involved the empirical identification of appropriate criteria followed by development of evaluation methods; the same research methods were used for each. The development and selection of criteria involved a survey of lay and clergy observers, development of questionnaire items and a secondary survey to rate those items for face validity, cluster and factor analyses of the item ratings, and the development of the final criterion-rating instrument. The second stage of the projects involved selection and development of assessment methods. Three methods were chosen: (1) paper and pencil case items, each consisting of a paragraph describing an actual situation that confronted a young pastor; (2) structured interviews, permitting a student to talk freely, completely fashioning his or her own response; and (3) behaviorally anchored rating scales. Reliability estimates and a description of the scaling of interview data are presented. A number of test items are included. (BW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SESSION 13.12

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."
"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Milo L. Brekke
Search Institute

ED152798

TM006 915

INSTRUMENTATION TO ASSESS READINESS FOR MINISTRY[1]

Milo L. Brekke
Youth Research Center, Minneapolis

This paper presents descriptions and examples of two types of instruments being developed to assess the readiness of seminary students to enter the ordained ministry: paper and pencil case items, and structured interviews. The descriptions are preceded by background concerning the projects and by a summary of the methods used to identify and select criterion characteristics to assess.

Background

Previous research sponsored by the Assocation of Theological Schools of the United States and Canada (A.T.S.) demonstrated that professional and client evaluators both hold different expectations of fledgling clergypersons than of ministers with several years of professional experience. The differences are of kind as well as degree (Hale, Thomas, and White 1971). This discrimination suggests the appropriateness of distinguishing the concept of readiness to begin ministry from the larger concept of "effectiveness in ministry". Readiness for ministry refers to a point or period in professional development of clergy and denotes the qualities, skills, and knowledge of the beginning minister which make him or her able to do the work of ministry acceptably and to continue growing toward professional maturity outside of the formal instructional setting and the protected status of "student" (Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke 1973).

With this perspective, in 1973 the Association of Theological Schools (A.T.S.) with generous funding from the Lilly Endowment, Inc., embarked on the three year,

---

[1]Paper prepared for symposium presentation at the 1976 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976.

The described work required the involvement of the entire research team and reflects the contribution of each of my colleagues, David Schuller, Merton Strommen, Daniel Aleshire and our associates at Y.R.C. and A.T.S.

"Assessment of Readiness of the Professional Practice of Ministry Project". From the perspective of theological education and the 198 member seminaries of the Association, the project was in the interest of shifting from concerns with resources and formal procedures to questions about measurable changes in the students effected by the educational system. From the perspective of the 47 denominations represented in the Association by their schools, it was a question of how they can determine with greater precision when a person is ready to enter the ministry and perform effectively. Youth Research Center (Y.R.C.) of Minneapolis, Minnesota, was chosen to carry primary responsibility for the research components of the project.

Just six months later the Lutheran Council U. S. A. with generous funding from Aid Association for Lutherans began a second, closely related, 3-year project with the eleven seminaries of three Lutheran church bodies. The Lutheran Seminarian Project (L.S.P.) focused not on the beginning minister (graduating senior), but the beginning seminary student (entering junior). Again Y.R.C. was chosen to conduct the research.

Both projects called for empirical identification of appropriate criteria followed by development of means of assessing some of those criteria: In the Readiness Project, criteria and means for assessing the readiness of graduating seminary seniors to enter professional ministry. In the L.S.P., means of assessing the needs and strengths of beginning seminary students. But the criteria to be identified were not the characteristics needed for successful student performance in seminary but rather what contributes to and detracts from effective professional ministry in general as perceived and idealized by Lutherans--so that strengths and needs of entering seminarians might be described in terms of criteria for effectiveness in the profession they are preparing eventually to enter.

The methods used to derive criteria and being used to develop instruments for assessment have been essentially the same in both projects. Therefore a single description of methods follows. Illustrations and examples are from whichever

project had data available at the time of writing (early April, 1976).

Development and Selection of Criteria

An extensive search of literature concerning assessment of competence in any profession was conducted particularly to identify sources of both criteria and methods. It included literature primarily of three types:

1. Research in theological education concerning assessment of performance in ministry (Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke 1973).

2. Lists of criteria for evaluating ministerial effectiveness developed by individuals, theological faculties, and denominational boards or judicatories.

3. Reports of similar efforts in evaluation of competency in other helping professions such as law, medicine, social work, teaching, nursing, and clinical psychology (Menges 1973, 1975).

Major conclusions suggested:

1. No other profession had empirically identified criteria for readiness to begin practice, though those involved in evaluation generally tended to recognize that need as a foundation for development of relevant means of assessment.

2. Criterion analysis should emphasize many discrete behaviors and characteristics rather than global definitions.

Identification of criteria.

For a precise and detailed account of methods used in empirical identification of readiness criteria see Schuller, Brekke, and Strommen, 1975. In summary, 16 months were devoted to developing a pool of criterion items and a preliminary criterion-rating instrument, administering the preliminary instrument and analyzing the data it produced, revising the preliminary instrument, administering the final criterion-rating instrument, deriving clusters common to all denominations (core criteria), and deriving second-order factors (families of criteria).

First a pool of more than 1,200 sentence descriptions of possible criterion characteristics or actions were developed from two major sources: (1) lists of criteria found in the review of literature and current related projects, and (2) descriptions of real-life critical incidents submitted by more than 400 lay

and clergy observers.

These statements were then organized into a taxonomy of logically interrelated categories and subcategories. This taxonomy provided one conceptualization of readiness criteria against which to compare the results of an empirically derived taxonomy based on the ratings of thousands of evaluators. Questionnaire items were developed that described a single criterion characteristic or skill that was behaviorally observable, that could be rated as to its positive or negative importance for a ministry context, and that reflected one aspect of the taxonomic categories.

The objective was to develop a criterion-rating instrument sufficiently comprehensive that every evaluator could find the criteria currently used, but short enough to complete. Approximately 2,000 items in the pool were submitted to a heterogeneous group of 25 experts who suggested deletions, additions, and modifications after examining the item pool for repetitions, omissions, ambiguity, equivocality, bias, and lack of the accents of particular religious traditions. As a result of their critiques, 834 highly modified items survived and were included in a preliminary criterion-rating instrument.

A seven-point scale was provided for rating the specific criterion items as to how desirable or detrimental for ministry each criterion characteristic or skill was considered to be by evaluators. A three-point scale was provided for rating the general criterion items which were the 147 categories and subcategories of the initial taxonomy. Each respondent was asked to select one of thirteen empirically identified ministry contexts as a frame of reference for responding to all items in the questionnaire, both general and specific.

Within the 47 denominations the preliminary form of the instrument was administered to a random sample of each of five evaluator groups: laity, seminary faculty and administrators, clergy, seminary seniors, and denominational officials responsible for theological education or placement. A careful design was used for selecting

two- and three- stage probability (random) samples, depending upon the evaluator group involved. A stratified probability sample of 79 schools from A.T.S. was the first-stage sample. Sampling was performed in such a way that laity and the four combined groups of professional evaluators would each comprise 50% of the samples. Even though very large total samples of approximately 5,500 were drawn, disproportionately large numbers of members of minority groups were oversampled and invited to participate (e.g., Hispanic-American clergy and laity, women clergy, and black clergy).

The preliminary survey produced three types of data: (1) usable ratings of both specific and general criteria from 2,011 respondents (461 lay people and 1,550 professionals); (2) 1,400 paragraphs of comments recommending deletions, additions, or modifications of instructions, ministry contexts, response possibilities, or criterion items; and (3) slightly more than 800 additional critical incidents.

Item discrimination analyses were performed in relation to each of the five evaluator groups, 13 ministry contexts, and 17 apriori organized denominational families. Rating data were used also to perform both cluster (homogeneous keying: Loevinger, 1947; DuBois, Loevinger, and Glaser, 1952) and factor analyses (principal components analysis followed by normal varimax rotation) separately for all of the items in each of the four major sections of the questionnaire and separately for three different groups of people: lay people alone, professionals alone, and lay people and professionals combined (all respondents). Results of these cluster and factor analyses were used particularly to determine whether empirically derived clusters of criterion items would be meaningful. They were used also to identify redundant criterion-items and small homogeneous sets needing additional items to balance the content of the questionnaire.

All evaluative comments were classified by section, item, and nature of criticism and used line by line to make questionnaire revisions and deletions. All discrete new criterion items as suggested by the 800 critical incidents were

written afresh and added to the enlarged item pool which was submitted to a second battery of consultant critics carefully selected to represent a very wide variety of ministry specialties, ministry contexts, and special concerns.

Typeface, overall layout, organization, general instructions, ministry contexts, response possibilities, and criterion items were all significantly revised before a semi-final version was field tested in ten locations.

The final criterion-rating instrument consisted of 440 specific criterion items and eleven items requesting personal data, all organized into seven sections, each introduced with a brief series of quotes from critical incidents highlighting the content of the section. Typical items appeared as follows:

41. Helps lay people relate Christian teachings to current issues and human needs.

45. Explains any changes introduced into the worship service.

116. Visits unchurched people to share the faith.

248. In counseling, shares own beliefs, opinions, suggestions without forcing them on a person.

292. Buys and reads a wide range of popular books and magazines.

293. Affirms that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

331. Talks openly about own experiences of fear and frustration.

461. Converses easily with the opposite sex.

534. Worries excessively about what others think of him/her.

569. Occasionally gambles.

689. Engenders a sense of community where members are concerned for each other.

As can be seen from the examples above, the level of abstraction/concretion of the criterion items varied greatly from the behaviorally observable to the phenomenological. Respondents indicated how important it was to them that a beginning minister possess each of the understandings, qualities, skills, and attitudes described by the items using a seven point scale with 7 = highly important, 6 = quite important, 5 = somewhat important, 4 = undesirable, 3 = detrimental, (2 =

rejection of item, 1 = item does not apply to denomination or ministry context).

Selection of the sample for five evaluator groups and administration of the final criterion-rating instrument was completed essentially in the same fashion as for the preliminary survey with the following exceptions: (1) the sample was almost twice as large, (2) no respondents were asked to be questionnaire critics though the final instrument did include a Comment Sheet allowing for criticisms or additional criteria, and (3) lay people were only from congregations being served by beginning ministers.

Participation. A total of 5,169 persons responded in some fashion (other than providing notification of refusal to participate); data from 4,895 were usable.

Deriving criteria common to all denominations (core clusters). The basic plan of analyzing the ratings in order to identify criteria that are generally accepted across all denominations (common-core criteria) was (1) to both cluster and factor analyze the ratings of all items by all respondents, and (2) then to identify the single criterion (characteristic or skill) described by all the items in each cluster that was derived jointly by both methods of analysis.

Settling on the details of this analytic design required taking a definite stand on a number of methodological issues. Those stands were taken not only on the basis of logic and theory but also on the basis of experimentation with data.

The following decisions were made regarding grouping of data:

1. To perform three separate sets of analyses based on data from all lay people only, from all professionals only, and from the total group (lay people and professionals combined).

2. Not to divide each of these three groups (lay, professional, and total group) into two random halves to further validate the generalizability of the analytic results.

3. In the set of total group data to weight lay people and professionals equally as groups.

4. In the sets of data from lay people only and professionals only to weight the denominational families equally.

5. Not to weight the denominations within each family, or the four kinds of evaluators among professionals, or the ministry contexts.

6. To analyze data from one section of the questionnaire at a time (not to combine several sections of items in one analysis).

7. To perform final cluster/factor analyses of the set of all leftover items from the entire questionnaire that did not find their way into clusters during the section-by-section analyses.

The following decisions were made regarding the scoring of data:

1. To give the seven possible ratings the numerical values of seven to one as follows: Highly important = 7, Quite important = 6, Somewhat important = 5, Undesirable = 4, Detrimental = 3, I reject this item = 2, and Does not apply = 1. (Therefore neither empirically scaling, resequencing, nor omitting any of the ratings.)

2. Not to transform the distributions of ratings.

The following decisions were made regarding the clustering and factoring techniques:

1. To use hierarchical clustering (Johnson 1967) and the method of principal components analysis.

2. To extract independent rather than correlated factors (orthogonal rotation).

3. Not to completely factor, but to derive only those factors that contain more information than a single item (eigenvalues greater than 1.00).

Deriving second-order factors (families of criteria). In the initial analyses, described above, 440 items were factored to produce 64 clusters (first-order factors). Then the 64 clusters were factor analyzed to produce 11 themes or families of clusters (second-order factors) (Schuller, Brekke, Strommen 1975). However, a single factor analysis of the interrelationships among all 64 clusters did not seem reasonable. It would have required calculating scores from individuals on clusters that were not derived from their data (for example, scoring lay people on clusters that were derived from and really represented the frame of reference of professionals only). Therefore three factor analyses were performed and the results were combined into a "best judgment" of what would have resulted had a single analysis of interrelationships among all clusters been legitimate.

Lutheran Seminarian Project.

Essentially the same methods were used to identify criterion-clusters and families of criteria regarding what contributes to and detracts from effective professional min-

istry in general. One-third of the Readiness items were used without change, one-third were highly modified to reflect Lutheran distinctives, and one-third were new based on extensive interviewing, criticism, and comparable pretesting among Lutherans only.

The seven-point rating scale was modified to fit contribution/detraction from effectiveness rather than importance to readiness, as follows: 7 = Absolutely essential, 6 = Contribute very much, 5 = Contribute quite a bit, 4 = Contribute somewhat, 3 = contribute little or nothing, 2 = hinder somewhat, and 1 = hinder very much. (Again for a small subset of items shown in pretest to draw predominantly negative ratings, in order to offer greater discrimination among the more popular ratings, the meanings of the rating possibilities were reversed from 7 = Absolutely disqualifying, 6 = Hinder very much, . . . to 1 = Contribute very much). The same seven sections and format of questionnaire otherwise were used with a slightly different method for indicating one's perspective in terms of ministry context.

Again multi-stage stratified probability samples of all five evaluator groups were drawn within church bodies. Slightly more than 5,000 respondents provided usable data.

By the same methods 77 discrete criterion-clusters (first-order factors) and nine families of criteria or areas of ministery (second-order factors) were derived (L.S.P. 1975) Again the empirical taxonomy of criteria provided by these factor structures resembled (but not entirely) the apriori, logical taxonomy used in instrument development.

Naming and describing clusters. Again two members of the research team worked independently giving titles and sentence descriptions to clusters, reconciled their differences through discussion, and subjected their work to the criticism of the third team member. The resulting titles and sentence descriptions of all common-core criteria were then submitted for written criticism to teams of denominational executives. Their critiques are reflected in the present names and descriptions of

core criteria.

A typical criterion-cluster (from L.S. P.) is shown in Table 1., and the family of criteria or area of ministry (second-order factor) to which that criterion-cluster is most highly related is shown in Table 2.

Table 1.

L.S.P. Criterion-Cluster 20: PASTORAL GUIDANCE

Guidance of others to sharpened consciousness of God's forgiveness and present power as well as to heightened personal commitment.

Load	Item No.	Item	*Mean
.71	266	Leads people to recognize ways God may be working in their lives.	6.062
.70	262	Leads people to deepened spiritual growth and commitment.	6.217
.68	271	Helps people use the resources of faith in coping with personal problems.	6.199
.59	260	When counseling, may sometimes confront person with the need to believe.	5.725
.51	249	Counsels on matters of wrong-doing with the intent of conveying the assurance of God's forgiveness.	6.103

Grand Mean = 6.06

* Interpretation of Average Scores

6.51-7.00	Absolutely Essential
5.51-6.50	Contribute Very Much
4.51-5.50	Contribute Quite a Bit
3.51-4.50	Contribute Somewhat
2.51-3.50	Contribute Little or Nothing
1.51-2.50	Hinder Somewhat
0.51-1.50	Hinder Very Much

Table 2.

L.S.P. Second-order Factor 2

(The family of criteria to which
L.S.P. criterion-cluster 20 is most highly related)

Lay Load	Total Group Load	Pro Load	Questionnaire Section	Cluster No.	Cluster Name	*Mean
.67	.77	.74	V	35	Personal Faith	6.48
.57	.73	.68	III	20	Pastoral Guidance	6.06
.61	.72	.74	II	11	Evangelism and Mission-Mindedness	5.79
.62	.69	.73	V	38	Ministry as a Calling	5.90
.62	.68	.72	V	36	Christian Example	6.05
.52	.51	.52	V	37	Accepting Mutual Ministry	6.00
		.71	IV	25	Scripture-based, Resurrection Faith	6.05
		.63	V	72	Confidence in Christ's Lordship	6.29
		.59	IV	28	Pastorally-oriented Biblical Scholarship	5.81
		.58	I	1	Communicating Grace and Forgiveness	6.20
		.53	I	8	Awareness of Children's Needs	5.16

Grand Mean = 5.98

* Interpretation of Average Scores

6.51-7.00	Absolutely Essential
5.51-6.50	Contribute Very Much
4.51-5.50	Contribute Quite a Bit
3.51-4.50	Contribute Somewhat
2.51-3.50	Contribute Little or Nothing
1.51-2.50	Hinder Somewhat
0.51-1.50	Hinder Very Much

Criteria distinctive of denominational families. Secondary analyses of subsets of data only from each of 17 denominational families (Readiness) and each of three Lutheran church bodies (L.S.P.) by the same methods have led to identification of denominationally distinctive additional criteria and nuances of core criteria. These criteria together with likenesses and differences related to a number of variables such as evaluator group, ministry context, age, sex, ethnic background, and geographic region will be presented in a book now being written by representatives of various denominations for publication by Harper and Row in 1977 or 78.

Selection of Both Criteria and Methods of Assessment.

Even had it been technically possible, neither project had ample resources to allow for development of instruments to assess all criteria (clusters) that were identified. In each instance the research team recommended a subset of approximately 40 criteria for consideration by an advisory group of both seminary and church-body representatives. The following were used as bases for selection of criteria for assessment in the L.S.P. (comparable were used in Readiness):

1. Possibility of the characteristic or skill being evidenced by an incoming seminarian.

2. Possibility of collecting needed evidence by one of the methods of assessment under consideration.

3. Rank order of the cluster as rated on the average by the 5,000 evaluators (concentration on the highest and lowest, the major qualifiers and disqualifiers).

4. Correlation of the cluster with its primary factor (concentration on more highly correlated).

5. Uniqueness of the cluster (concentration on more distinctive).

6. Necessity for evidence being collected regarding potential recipients of ministry as well as the incoming seminarian (limited to the seminarian at this time).

7. Possibility of the characteristic being modified by seminary experience.

8. Advice from the Advisory Council or Instrument Design Panel.

In relation to the second basis above, the research team made a simple analysis of the primary type of characteristic described by each of the items comprising every

criterion-cluster, whether skill, attitude, belief, or what. This was done for at least two reasons: first to determine if criterion-clusters were largely singular or conglomorate (found to be considerable conglomerate), and second to identify the type and source of data required for assessment. Table 3 summarizes the results.

Table 3.

Types of Primary Characteristics
Described in Readiness Criterion-Clusters
by Percentages of Items.

Percentage	General Type	Specific Type
17%	Skill	Transitive, requiring data from recipient of ministry regarding effect.
13%	Skill	Intransitive, requiring evidence of degree or quality.
48%	Skill	Intransitive, possible only requiring evidence of presence-absence.
4%	Trait	Personal quality.
2%	Attitude	Perspective.
4%	Phenomenological	Self perception.
5%	Phenomenological	Goal or motive.
2%	Cognition	Knowledge.
3%	Cognition	Understanding
3%	Cognition	Belief

The emphasis upon skills as shown in Table 3 suggested the advisability of developing the most direct types of measurement in which actual samples of criterion behavior would be observed. That was also supported by the major conclusions, as follows, from the literature searches mentioned above:

1. Measures of behaviors and characteristics should be as similar to the criteria themselves as possible. Means of assessment should, whenever possible,

attempt to elicit an actual work sample or sample of criterion performance, rather than something known or assumed to be predictive of the criterion.

2. Criterion-referenced measures are to be preferred to the more traditional norm-referenced measures.

3. Multiple assessment devices should be used so that no type is overemphasized. Measures of subject matter knowledge in particular, should be less heavily weighted.

4. Data should be combined by statistical rather than clinical methods.

5. Data should not be used for decision-making until longitudinal studies demonstrate predictive validity.

6. Collaboration between candidate and examiner should be encouraged, since the most accurate decisions would result from open collaboration, and it would sharpen the candidate's skills of professional self-evaluation.

However a number of circumstances militated against that decision: higher regular costs for use than schools or students could pay, the extreme difficulty of development and low likelihood of regular success (e.g., problem of controlling for comparability of field situation for observation) and, lack of consistent patterns of internship and field work schedules among schools. Also specific assumptions about the nature of professionalism influenced decisions about criteria and methods of assessment. Being a professional was understood as not only a matter of which competencies are possessed, or of which competencies are used and which ignored, but of which competencies are used when and how (a matter of judgment in varied circumstances).

Therefore three methods, each with some degree of indirectness, were chosen: Paper and pencil case items to provide a degree of simulation and standardization of circumstances for making judgments. Structured interview with complex scoring key to allow the seminarian to report whatever circumstances and judgments seem appropriate to the question, and to give highly word-oriented ministerial students and faculties an experience generally perceived by them as more humane than mark-sense answer sheets and machine scoring. Behaviorally anchored rating scales to give seminarian-interns, field supervisors, and lay clients more systematic and reliable

ways to summarize their observations of students and fledgling clergy in real-life ministry situations--always complex and very difficult to assess. To avoid limitations of method specificity, whenever possible more than one method of assessment was attempted for a single criterion.

Case Instrumentation

Case items, as evolved to date, each consist of a paragraph describing an actual situation that confronted some young pastor. This case stem is followed by sets of brief, written descriptions (1) of actions or approaches to a single aspect of the situation, (2) of objectives or purposes, and (3) of rationale or theory. Each set is introduced with a focus-question.

The student is asked, using a 5-point Likert-type scale (Very likely--Very unlikely), to indicate the likelihood in the situation described that he/she would adopt <u>each</u> of the courses of action, objective, and rationale. The young minister or priest is <u>not</u> asked to select the one most- or least-likely response, but is asked to rate <u>every</u> response-possibility. The range of responses included in each case reflects what hundreds of students and young clergy indicated as their likely response; therefore the "answers" as well as the cases reflect the real world. Since responses to a given case may relate to several dimensions of ministry, a comprehensive profile emerges for a given student.

See Appendix A for samples of L.S.P. case items.

The value in using the brief case approach lies in assessing a person's ability to integrate a variety of factors to respond to a real situation. Its limitations involve the use of paper and pencil, responding to structured possibilities (which may suggest better answers than the student may have been capable of), and the restricted amount of information provided in the case itself. Moreover, the student is indicating the <u>likelihood</u> of his/her responding in that given fashion. One does not know whether the student would indeed thus respond in such an actual situation. Therefore, the report to the student is presented in terms of the like-

lihood estimates she/he has provided. In criterion-referenced fashion, these estimates of the probability that the student will manifest a given characteristic are reported in comparison with the degree of importance that denominational evaluators (on the average) attributed to that criterion characteristic.

Development of Case Items

In summary, more than 18 months were devoted to variously successful attempts at writing case items by a panel of clergy, evaluation and modification of the process, second panel attempts at writing, submission of case stems for open-ended completion by a large sample of seminarians, content analysis of open-ended data into the range of typical responses, pretest and revision of casebooks including preliminary factoring into case-clusters, broader field-testing of two case books, factoring of case responses, matching of factors to criteria, scaling and estimating reliabilities, and attempting to develop some parallel forms using stepwise regression techniques.

A panel of writers. Considering general past difficulties in generating brief but realistic descriptions of cases from life, both theological and measurement consultants recommended involving experienced clergy to begin the case item development and to face measurement issues gradually later. A panel of 12 members of the Academy for Parish Clergy, representing a wide range on the denominational spectrum, were engaged for writing. They were introduced to selected criterion-clusters; requested to write paragraph descriptions of real-life situations in which they would expect competent ministers to evidence the criterion characteristics or skills, and also asked to write brief descriptions of what pastors of varying degrees of competence might do in these situations in attempts to minister. One hundred cases in initial forms which varied greatly by writer were produced and criticized by both the panel and research team.

Strengths and weaknesses. Case stems (situation paragraphs) were generally judged to be realistic and rich in terms of areas of ministry represented, denominational flavor, and interest. Response-possibilities generally suffered from the following: (1) lack of realism; (2) narrowness of range; (3) lack-of-fit to criterion; (4) mixture within case of actions, opinions, feelings, motives, objectives, rationales, etc.; (5) mixture within case of obvious responses to a variety of facets of the situation; (6) often too obvious attempts to organize response-possibilities in such ways as (a) one right answer and several distractors, or (b) a continuum of degrees of criterion behavior, or (c) a set of cases across which the same five or six criteria were represented in the only response-possibilities offered. After an additional workshop led to production of 50 more case items, critiques of the new resembled the old. There was still much confusion about whether the case stem or the response-possibilities, or both, must match the criterion-cluster.

Modifications of the process. Systematic analysis of all cases led to conclusions that it was necessary to: (1) develop specific focus questions for each case to isolate the facet of the situation to respond to; (2) enable respondents to be able to specify: "I would choose this action(s) toward this objective(s) operating under this rationale(s)"; (3) clarify the role or position of the respondent in the case situation, if anything other than lone pastor of the parish; (4) abandon attempts to organize response-possibilities on one or more continua within a case; (5) test cases in open-ended answer form, on a wide range of seminary students and alumni across denominational families in order to secure viable responses and to ensure that the range of possible responses has been covered.

Test of open-ended cases. A judgment sample of 350 students, faculty, and recent alumni from 44 seminaries was secured to give open-ended written response to ten each of 100 case stems that had been carefully selected to provide a

balanced range across several variables within the case situation such as age and gender of persons involved, geography, ministry context, church polity and terminology used, and whether individual or group-centered. Three focus questions concerning action, objective, and rationale were attached to each case stem. Initial attempts at analyses of contingencies among answers to the three questions were quickly abandoned when it was clearly demonstrated that answers across the questions were at least semi-independent. The 3500 open-ended, three-part case item responses were carefully content analyzed and summarized into the range of relatively discrete answers to each question for each case. The work of each content analyst was reviewed by at least two other persons, both theologically trained. Sixty-two cases survived, all with realistic response-possibilities that someone had declared would actually be theirs given the circumstances. By this time, cases developed to secure evidence for one criterion were obviously eliciting answers matching other criteria.

Further testing for range. All cases were then pretested by a judgment sample of 280 seminarians using the newly-constructed multiple-choice answers and an "other" (open-end) option for each section of each case. The very small number of "other" responses were summarized and revisions of cases and responses made accordingly. Data from other response-possibilities was factor analyzed (principal components, varimax) by sets of cases originally designed to assess the same criterion. Most resulting factors were case specific and combinations of action, objective, and rationale responses. With three research team members as judges about 75% of the resulting clusters of responses (of more than 2 highest loading items and eigenvalues greater than 1.00) were matched (70% agreement) to half-again as many criteria as they were designed for. Cases were discarded for irrelevance, redundancy, and insufficient number of items en toto related to certain criteria.

Broad Field Test.

After careful editing for matters such as sex-bias in language and role descriptions, a set of 46 case items in two casebooks was field tested in a random sample of 69 seminaries, 56 of which agreed to a census sample of their senior classes. Each of the casebooks was completed by a random half of the total of just under 1000 seniors. Essentially the same factor analytic (this time case by case) and matching procedures were performed as previously. Most cases were found to consist of two or more homogeneous clusters of response-possibilities (case-clusters) each judged to be an example of one criterion-characteristic. Example One (next page) shows how a very small and relatively weak case item (L.S.P. Case 2101), originally developed to assess Criterion 21: Enabling and Perceptive Counseling (Skill in aiding persons under stress to work through serious problems and doing so with perception, sensitivity, and warmth that is freeing and supportive), consisted primarily of two case-clusters: one a measure of Criterion 21 and the other a measure of Criterion 20: Pastoral Guidance (See Table 1). Data from each case-cluster judged to measure a criterion were submitted to reciprocal averaging (Mosier 1946) to see if the items (case responses) in the cluster would form a unidimensional scale with reasonable internal consistency reliability (Hoyt 1941, equivalent to Cronbach 1951). With the deletion of occasional items, almost all scaled unidimensionally.

Combined Case-Clusters, Reliability Estimates, and Parallel Forms.

Sets of case clusters that were all judged to be measures of the same criterion-characteristic were then combined additively, if the decision of the judges was corroborated by intercorrelations among the clusters. Clusters generally not significantly ($p > .05$) correlating with the rest in the adjudged set, or deviating markedly from the average intercorrelations, were not combined. All the items (case responses) in each such set of clusters were then submitted to reciprocal averaging to test the unidimensionality of the whole set. All scaled well except

sets measuring criteria 19, 20, 41, and 76 which showed some slight signs of redundancy or multidimensionality. Table 4 shows pre- and post-scaling reliability estimates for sets of L.S.P. case-clusters.

Table 4.

Internal Consistency Reliability Estimates, Pre and Post Scaling, for Combined Sets of Case-Clusters by L.S.P. Criteria.

# of Clusters	# of Items	Criterion Number and Descriptor		Hoyt's Reliability Before and After Scaling
3	11	Criterion 17	AGGRESSIVE POLITICAL LEADERSHIP	.86 → .87
4	12	Criterion 19	RESTRICTED SPIRITUAL FOCUS	.76 → .80
9	50	Criterion 20	PASTORAL GUIDANCE	.95 → .95
11	48	Criterion 21	ENABLING AND PERCEPTIVE COUNSELING	.90 → .90
6	23	Criterion 22	GRACIOUS AVAILABILITY	.83 → .84
4	27	Criterion 25	SCRIPTURE-BASED, RESURRECTION FAITH	.91 → .92
1	6	Criterion 26	COMMUNICATION OF LIFE-RELATED THEOLOGY	.77 → .79
2	16	Criterion 28	PASTORALLY-ORIENTED BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP	.81 → .84
4	19	Criterion 31	SCHOLARLY OPENNESS AND OBJECTIVITY	.87 → .90
9	46	Criterion 33	REPRISTINATION THEOLOGY	.95 → .96
4	14	Criterion 41	COMMITMENT TO FAMILY	.73 → .82
3	13	Criterion 42	NON-DEFENSIVE INTEGRITY	.76 → .82
3	13	Criterion 51	INSECURE AUTHORITARIANISM	.81 → .84
2	10	Criterion 56	SHARING OF CONGREGATIONAL LEADERSHIP	.60 → .73
4	15	Criterion 57	CREATIVE USE OF CONFLICT	.78 → .82
4	13	Criterion 61	RESPECT FOR PROPER PROCEDURES	.74 → .83
6	27	Criterion 76	RESPONSIBLE GROUP LEADERSHIP	.85 → .86

LSP CASE 2101
BOOK II

Example 1.

Mr. and Mrs. Andrews and their five-year-old son Jimmy are fellow-members of your church. Last Saturday morning, while Mrs. Andrews was away from home and Mr. Andrews was spading the garden, Jimmy, who had been playing near his father, ran into the street and was injured by a hit-run driver. When you go to visit Jimmy at the hospital, he is still unconscious. Mr. Andrews is there alone. He looks up at you, shakes his head, and says, "It's my fault. I'ts my fault."

---

5 - VERY LIKELY 4 - LIKELY 3 = POSSIBLY 2 = UNLIKELY 1 = VERY UNLIKELY

A) How would you minister to the father's most evident need?

* 1-20 1. Talk with him about God's love and acceptance.

_____ 2. Reassure him that it isn't his fault; accidents do happen.

1-20 3. Pray with him asking God to relieve him of his guilt and heal Jimmy.

2-21 4. Listen to him, try to comfort him, and help him deal with his sense of guilt.

1-20 5. Tell him that God has his reasons for letting this happen--so he should trust His loving care.

_____ 6. Tell him not to feel guilty.

2-21 7. Listen to him, stay with him as long as necessary, but avoid sermonizing about his guilt or God's grace.

_____ Other:

B) What principle or belief would you use to support your attempt to minister?

_____ 7. It is important that a person's feelings be shared--and not cut off by pious remarks, or denial of the real feelings.

2-21 8. It is important that a person know of God's love, but he/she must be able to ventilate feelings first.

1-20 9. People in crisis situations like these need to hear the comforting message of the gospel.

_____10. The son's accident is now a fact of life. Feelings of guilt will only make it more difficult to deal with this reality.

1-20 11. People need to be assured that God works out all things for their good.

1-20 12. Individuals can deal with their guilt if they know forgiveness and acceptance.

_____13. Persons need to understand that God does not injure people in order to punish others.

* First digit = factor number from analysis of this case.
Digits 2 and 3 = criterion that factor was judged to measure.

As a further demonstration of internal consistency across cases, and in hopes of significantly reducing the number of cases to be completed for any one assessment process, an attempt was made to develop parallel forms by use of stepwise regression (predicting the total set scores with the case-cluster scores). It was assumed that equal R^2's (percentages of variance accounted for) from two subsets of clusters would constitute parallel forms. Generally speaking, as might be anticipated, success was directly related to the number of clusters in the set. Table 5, reading columns from left to right, shows reliability estimates for individual case-clusters, then the combined set of clusters, and finally the two parallel forms A and B for each of two criteria. It also shows in the right most column that two highly reliable parallel measures for each of two criteria (20 and 21) were developed from eleven cases (two of which--3302 and 3303--also contributed to measures of criteria 33 and 31).

Appendix B lists the specific items (case responses) and factors (case-clusters) that constitute parallel measures A and B for Criterion 20: Pastoral Guidance.

Structured Interview

Augmenting the case approach, is a structured interview that permits a student to talk freely, completely fashioning his/her own response. The direction of the answer, the structure of the argument, the type and quality of supporting evidence are entirely up to the candidate. While the interview has been a traditional means of assessment, the greatest difficulty in the past has centered in low interjudge reliability. Whether a professional candidate (in a variety of fields) passed or failed was as much dependent on the examiner as on the quality of the person's responses. Therefore much of the research team's efforts were addressed to the development of keys that will minimize individual difference among those coding the interviews. The L.S.P. and Readiness interviews, as presently developed, can be administered with a minimum of interview training and general

Table 5

Cases Required, Percentages of Variance Explained (R^2), and Internal Consistency Reliability Estimates (Rxx) for Single Case-Clusters, Whole Sets of Case-Clusters Measuring Criteria 20 and 21, and Parallel Subsets of Case-Clusters Measuring Criteria 20 and 21 (Sample n = 196)

N of Items	Single Cluster Hoyt's Rxx	Criterion-Cluster I.D.	Whole Set Hoyt Rxx	Whole Set Cumulative R^2	Form A Cumulative R^2	Form B Hoyt Rxx	Form B Cumulative R^2	Form B Hoyt Rxx	Requires Additional Case ?
				Criterion 20					
7	.85	2107-1-20*		.73	.73				X
7	.88	2102-1-20		.85	.85	.94			X
6	.71	2109-2-20		.91	.91				X
8	.86	2105-1-20		.95					X
6	.79	2101-1-20	.95	.96			.76		X
5	.68	3302-4-20		.98			.84	.87	X
6	.82	2106-1-20		.99			.65		X
3	.80	2109-3-20		.995			.88		
3	.53	3302-5-20		1.00					
				Criterion 21					
6	.78	2109-1-21		.62	.62				
4	.72	3303-2-21		.78	.78				X
6	.76	2102-2-21		.85	.85	.86			
4	.65	2503-2-21		.90	.90				X
4	.63	2105-3-21		.93	.93				
5	.56	2202-1-21		.95			.81		X
6	.66	2106-3-21	.90	.97			.67		
5	.68	2106-3-21		.98			.49	.79	
3	.55	2101-2-21		.99			.76		
3	.61	2105-4-21		.99			.90		
3	.70	2107-2-21		1.00			.87		

*Key

Digits 1 and 2 = criterion for which case was created.

Digits 3 and 4 = series number of the case.

Digit 5 = factor number from analysis of case.

Digits 6 and 7 = criterion judged as measured by that factor.

interviewing skills, since they allow no interviewer probing and no departure from rigidly prescribed texts. By contrast, learning to score either of the present interviews is at best a several day's challenge because of the complex scoring keys which have gradually evolved from 0/1 dichotomous presence-absence scoring to use of a 4 point scale indicating degree of evidence or likelihood of the presence of a criterion-characteristic. Mastery of the more than 100-page key to each interview requires not only firm grasp of the conceptualization of the three to five questions related to each criterion, but also complete familiarity with typical examples of answers at various levels. The research team, therefore, must thoroughly train those in the schools who will be responsible for coding interviews, and proposes certifying them for this task only when they reach a minimum level of .80 interjudge reliability. See Appendix C for an example of the scoring key for two of the five questions in the L.S.P. interview that are used to assess Criterion-cluster 35: Personal Faith. To compare sample scoring key with criterion, see Table 6 which lists the items of which Criterion-cluster 35 is composed.

In extensive testing during the past sixteen months, students have been largely enthusiastic about the value of the interview as a means for systematically reflecting on the sweep of qualities and tasks involved in contemporary ministry. In turn, most persons who have administered the interviews have reported gaining a significant amount of new information and insight into the lives of students whom they often felt they already knew well.

Table 6

L.S.P. Criterion - Cluster 35: PERSONAL FAITH

Use of prayer, word, and sacrament that shows a profound sense of dependence on God's sustaining, guiding, and redeeming activity.

Load	Item No.	Item	*Mean
.63	386	Acknowledges own sin and confesses this to God.	6.647
.56	382	Uses Scripture as a source of spiritual nourishment.	6.409
.56	387	Spends time daily in private prayer and meditation.	6.275
.51	389	Lives with a sense of daily forgiveness.	6.386
.50	366	Shows sensitivity to the leading of the Holy Spirit.	6.300
.42	361	Believes the Gospel he/she preaches.	6.828

Grand Mean = 6.48

* Interpretation of Average Scores

6.51-7.00	Absolutely Essential
5.51-6.50	Contribute Very Much
4.51-5.50	Contribute Quite a Bit
3.51-4.50	Contribute Somewhat
2.51-3.50	Contribute Little or Nothing
1.51-2.50	Hinder Somewhat
0.51-1.50	Hinder Very Much

History of the development of the interview is extremely complex, so much so as to nearly defy description in this relatively brief paper. For example, the Readiness interview progressed through six drafts before its most recent, major field testing. It began with 170 questions to which another 45 were gradually added while 118 were dropped. And most of the surviving 97 were greatly modified before they were used with 100 students from among the nearly 1000 who participated in the broad field test of case instruments.

In its early stages it was developed jointly with staff of Selection Research Incorporated which has a 20 year history of development of interviews to select potentially highly successful teachers. Characteristic of their method of development is to begin with a group of experienced practitioners, identified by peers and clients as highly competent in the skills and characteristics to be assessed. The first goal was to identify commonalities characteristic of their answers to a large battery of questions judged likely to elicit evidence of the often more phenomenological criteria selected for assessment by interview. The second goal was to identify the form(s) those same common answers from the highly competent take when expressed by fledgling practitioners or students also judged by teachers and peers to be among the most competent in variables under assessment. The third goal was to isolate, out of the total interview, small subsets of questions that elicit internally consistent sets of answers that discriminate among persons judged again by others who know them well as having either very little or very much of a specific criterion characteristic or skill.

Therefore the process of development began with interviewing of 60 ministers from most denominational families, all highly recommended by their respective denominational officials as highly competent in several of the specific criteria chosen for assessment by interview. The process continued with interviewing of 75 seminarians comparably identified by professor or professors as being particularly

high or low on criteria to which questions related. Finally with a very much modified, surviving set of 97 questions, interviews were administered in 56 schools to 100 graduating seniors each of whom had been rated on all 22 criteria, by three to five persons the seniors selected as "knowing me well" regarding the criteria.

Throughout, the scoring key was shaped by correlations of answers with criterion ratings and by correlations among answers to small sets of questions hypothesized to be related to the same underlying criterion variable.

A Sample of Results

Such correlations both with criterion ratings and among answers to small sets of criterion-interrelated questions have been modest throughout. Yet, in the L.S.P., for example, unidimensional scales for 16 criteria have been verified by the scaling method of reciprocal averages, as shown in Table 7. The fact that these are scales developed from the numerical scoring of interview data, and with a very small number of questions in each scale, should be taken into consideration in any evaluation of the modest internal consistency reliability estimates.

By contrast, the inter-rater reliabilities among research team members, calculated at random during scoring of the last 82 first year seminarian interviews are considerably higher. They ranged from .74 to .88 with an average of .81 across all questions in the entire interview.

Conclusion

Though it is necessary evidence, reliability is not sufficient evidence and in no way guarantees validity. This work of developing instrumentation to assess readiness for ministry continues in process. Work toward establishing validities has begun.

Table 7.

Internal Consistency Reliability Estimates (Rxx) and Numbers of Items in Unidimensional Scales Developed From L.S.P. Field Test Data (Interview Only)

Criterion Number and Descriptor		Hoyt's Rxx	# of Questions
Criterion 1	COMMUNICATING GRACE AND FORGIVENESS	.63	5
Criterion 2/3	ENCOURAGING RESPONSIBILITY TO MEANS OF GRACE CREATING SENSE OF GOD'S FAMILY	.48	3
Criterion 35	PERSONAL FAITH	.63	5
Criterion 39	CANDID CHRISTIAN HUMANNESS	.56	5
Criterion 41	COMMITMENT TO FAMILY	.45	3
Criterion 42	NON-DEFENSIVE INTEGRITY	.51	4
Criterion 44	POSITIVE APPROACH	.57	3
Criterion 45	IMPERVIOUSNESS TO THREAT	.58	5
Criterion 48	NEGATIVE, SELF-CENTERED ISOLATIONISM	.58	4
Criterion 51	INSECURE AUTHORITARIANISM	.55	3
Criterion 63	LAW UNTO SELF	.50	3
Criterion 65	RELATING BIBLICAL FAITH TO EVERYDAY EXPERIENCE	.60	4
Criterion 68	OPEN EVALUATIVE STANCE	.48	4
Criterion 72	CONFIDENCE IN CHRIST'S LORDSHIP	.50	3
Criterion 73	SIMUL JUSTIS ET PECCATOR	.54	3
Criterion 75	SELF-ISOLATING BEHAVIOR	.47	3

References

Cronbach, L. 1951. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16: 297-334.

DuBois, P.; Loevinger, J.; and Glaser, G. 1952. The construction of homogeneous keys for a biographical inventory. Research Bulletin, 52-18. USAF Human Resources Center. Lackland AFB, San Antonio.

Hale, R.; Thomas, M.; and White III, A.I. 1971. Report of summer research, unpublished report for A.T.S.

Hoyt, C. 1941. Test reliability estimated by analysis of variance. Psychometrika, 6: 153-160.

Johnson, S.C. 1967. Heirarchical clustering schemes. Psychometrika, 32: 241-254.

Loevinger, J. 1947. A systematic approach to the construction and valuation of tests of ability. Psych. Mono., 61: iii-49.

Lutheran Seminarian Project. 1975. Core Criteria. Unpublished preliminary report of the project. Minneapolis: Youth Research Center.

Menges, R. 1973. Assessing readiness for professional practice. Occasional paper of the Center for the Teaching Professions. Evanston: Northwestern University.

_____. 1975. Assessing readiness for Professional practice. Rev. Educ. Res., 45: 173-207.

Mosier, C. 1946. Machine methods of scaling by reciprocal averages. Proceedings of the research forum. IBM Corporation.

Schuller, D.; Brekke, M.; and Strommen, M. 1973. The assessment of readiness for the practice of professional ministry: rationale and method. Theological Education 10, 1: 50-65.

Schuller, D.; Brekke, M.; and Strommen, M. 1975. Readiness for Ministry Volume I: Criteria. Vandalia: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada.

APPENDIX A*

LSP Case 4204 The pastor of a neighboring Lutheran church--a man you know well from working with him in several summer camps--has asked you to come speak to his high school youth group about the factors that led you to decide to enter seminary. As you are speaking, you notice two boys at the back of the room carrying on their own conversation. They talk quietly at first, but their whispering and occasional bursts of half-suppressed laughter become a source of distraction to others. Suddenly the pastor stands and delivers a tongue-lashing to the boys, telling them they ought, above all, to grant respect to someone who is entering the ministry. When he finishes his reprimand, he sits down, and you must speak into the ensuing silence.

5 = VERY LIKELY	4 = LIKELY	3 = POSSIBLY	2 = UNLIKELY	1 = VERY UNLIKELY

A) What message about yourself would you wish to convey to the young people with what you say next?

_____ 1. That I am an honest person, and that honesty implies admission of my own negative feelings as well as positive.

_____ 2. That I do not believe I should command more respect than is due any other person, simply because of my profession.

_____ 3. That I believe it is necessary to respect the high office of the ministry.

_____ 4. That I believe it is important to extend courtesy and respect to all people.

_____ 5. That I support their pastor and his right to be angry over their behavior.

_____ 6. That I am human, too, and have done things that I regretted later.

_____ 7. That I respect them.

_____ 8. That I appreciate an attentive audience.

_____ 9. That I consider the reprimand too severe to fit the "crime."

_____10. That I highly respect the office of the Holy Ministry and believe they should, also.

_____11. That situations like this are difficult for me and I'm not quite sure where to go from here.

_____12. That the incident was not of major importance to me.

_____ Other:

B) How would you convey it?

_____13. Rely on humor, not connected with the incident, to restore good feeling.

(More responses next page)

* From Brekke, Instrumentation to Assess Readiness for Ministry.

5 = VERY LIKELY	4 = LIKELY	3 = POSSIBLY	2 = UNLIKELY	1 = VERY UNLIKELY

_____14. Admit discomfort or anger over the boys' behavior.

_____15. Speak of the power of the laity to increase respect for the office of ministry by demonstrating their respect.

_____16. Disagree with the pastor, but be respectful of his feelings.

_____17. Speak with humor of my own less-than-perfect behavior at their age.

_____18. Continue speaking on the theme of respect for the ministry mentioned by the pastor, and encourage their respect for each other, too.

_____19. Continue speaking without reference to the incident.

_____20. Ask the boys at the back of the room if they would like to share jokes or ideas with the entire group.

_____21. Speak of my own failure to respect the office of the Holy Ministry as I should.

_____22. Solicit the expression of the negative feelings of the boys.

_____23. Give my reasons for wanting to take on the office of ministry.

_____ Other:

LSP Case 7602

You are the chairperson of the christian education committee in your parish, which is to meet tonight. This morning you find in your mail, a copy of the treasurer's current report which reveals that, with half the year's activities ahead, the education director has spend the entire year's christian education budget, principally by hiring professional educational consultants and securing resource materials for staff use. The congregation in general accepts the director as a fine person and as an outstanding educator who has high standards and maintains an attractive and lively program.

This over-spending of the budget--not the first such occurrence--presents a problem in that the christian education committee had planned to replace some archaic audio-visual equipment and to begin work on the children's pageant which traditionally ends the year. You are aware that Mr. Allard, a member of your committee, bears the director some malice because his daughter was passed over for leading parts in the pageant last year. Mr. Allard has been known to declare that the director "has gotten too big for his britches" and should be replaced. The education director is a member of the committee also.

5 = VERY LIKELY	4 = LIKELY	3 = POSSIBLY	2 = UNLIKELY	1 = VERY UNLIKELY

A) <u>What would you say or do, as chairperson, to provide responsible group leadership?</u>

_____ 1. Discuss the situation in advance with the director so he could be prepared for questions and could present possible solutions.

_____ 2. Suggest that if the director can't work within established financial guidelines then he may need to be replaced.

_____ 3. Remind the committee member that his problem with the director is personal, and the budget problem should not be used as a way to retaliate.

_____ 4. Try to arrange for more funds for the current year.

_____ 5. Remind the committee of the director's excellent work and the difficulty of replacing good staff members.

_____ 6. Suggest that the education committee, education director, and finance committee meet together to establish definite financial guidelines.

_____ 7. Encourage the director and committee to establish priorities; i.e., should money be spent for A.V. materials or a children's Pageant.

_____ 8. Ask the committee to make a decision about whether to go ahead with this year's planned acquisitions, and how to finance them if they do.

_____ Other:

5 = VERY LIKELY	4 = LIKELY	3 = POSSIBLY	2 = UNLIKELY	1 = VERY UNLIKELY

B) On what principle, theory, or belief would your action be based?

_____ 9. Reconciliation becomes possible when all opinions are voiced in an open committee meeting.

_____10. On the one hand a committee must be kept aware that good programs cost money; on the other, the director must be kept aware of the importance of operating within budget guidelines.

_____11. The director's attempts to expand the program should not be stifled.

_____12. The director should be given the opportunity to argue for an expanded budget.

_____13. Individuals like the education director do not have the authority to violate decisions made through proper channels.

_____14. Committees must not be allowed to become forums for personal reprisals.

_____15. A committee chairperson's task is to guide the committee so that all facts and views are presented in such a way that the committee can make a meaningful decision.

_____16. Budgeting should be done democratically and jointly by committees and appointed leaders.

_____ Other:

APPENDIX B*

Case-Clusters (Factors) Which Comprise the Two Parallel Forms of Measurement of L.S.P. Criterion 20: Pastoral Guidance

---

FORM A

LSP Case 2107: There is a special bond between you and your uncle Ted. At least once every summer since you were very young, you have gone fishing with him. Recently, at the age of 41, he has been hospitalized with an inoperable tumor and has been told he has only a few months to live. This information is known to all the family, but Ted has not spoken of his impending death to anyone. You go to see him in the hospital. When you have been there for a few minutes, he says to you, following a period of silence, "I want you to have my fishing boat and motor after...after I die. And I think they'll be yours by spring."

Case and Factor	Factor Load	Item No.	Item
2107-1-20	.87	B 11	Prayer for healing is effective, and is an expression of faith in God's power.
	.79	A 7	Pray with him for healing.
	.79	B 12	God, not doctors, sets the length of a person's life.
	.73	B 15	God can work healing miracles through faith, prayer, and the will to live.
	.66	A 5	Help him prepare for death by talking about his relationship with the Lord, and about eternal life.
	.63	B 19	The welfare of the soul is more important than the health of the body.
	.63	B 17	Death is real and powerful, and our only hope against it is in Christ's resurrection.

* From Brekke, Instrumentation to Assess Readiness for Ministry.

LSP Case 2102 Your mother's physician has recommended that she undergo major surgery. The operation is scheduled for next week. Tonight your mother phones you, greatly disturbed. This afternoon she went to visit a friend who had just undergone the same type of surgery and discovered that the friend was in intensive care; the friend suffered severe hemorrhaging following the surgery and is still in serious condition. Your mother is frightened and no longer sure that she wants to go through with her own planned surgery. "It's a lot more dangerous than I thought," she says. "Maybe I ought to think about this some more."

2102-1-20	.88	A 8	Encourage her to cast her concerns on the Lord, and trust his providence.
	.82	A 5	Pray with her about the uncertainties of the surgery.
	.81	B 13	An understanding of the message of Christ gives strength to handle the fears of life.
	.78	A 9	Remind her that, if she's a Christian, Christ is with her whether she lives or dies. If she's not a Christian, witness to her.
	.73	B 17	For the Christian, all things work together for the good.
	.58	A 4	Emphasize the physician's skill and God's providence.
	.44	B 16	The most important thing, here, is to give her assurance that she is not alone in the struggle.

LSP Case 2109: You attend an inter-church meeting where speakers present both pro- and anti-abortion views. When the group is divided into smaller units for discussion, you meet a middle-aged woman who has recently accepted Christ and become a member of a nearby parish. After the meeting adjourns, the two of you continue to talk. She tells you that several years ago she contracted German measles in the early weeks of a pregnancy, and, on the assumption that the child was damaged, had an abortion. Her newly-sensitized conscience is now giving her considerable trouble over that abortion. She cannot be at rest about the taking of the child's life, and she fears God's anger over it. She says to you, "I just keep going over this and over this in my mind. I can't seem to get it settled for myself. Do you know anything that could help me resolve it?"

2109-2-20	.74	B 17	She needs a clear word from the Lord (scripture) to be sure she is forgiven.
	.73	A 4	Suggest that she read some Scripture (you may wish to identify a good passage here _____).
	.56	A 6	Offer to arrange an appointment for her with my pastor or hers.
	.55	A 5	Listen while she expresses her feelings, then assure her of God's forgiveness.
	.52	B 12	Insights sometimes come best to people through reading Scripture or devotional books.
	.48	A 3	Give personal witness to how I see God dealing with people.

FORM B

LSP Case 2101: Mr. and Mrs. Andrews and their five-year-old son Jimmy are fellow-members of your church. Last Saturday morning, while Mrs. Andrews was away from home and Mr. Andrews was spading the garden, Jimmy, who had been playing near his father, ran into the street and was injured by a hit-run driver. When you go to visit Jimmy at the hospital, he is still unconscious. Mr. Andrews is there alone. He looks up at you, shakes his head, and says, "It's my fault. It's my fault."

Case and Factor	Factor Load	Item No.	Item
2101-1-20	.80	B 12	Individuals can deal with their guilt if they know forgiveness and acceptance.
	.79	B 9	People in crisis situations like these need to hear the comforting message of the gospel.
	.77	B 11	People need to be assured that God works out all things for their good.
	.75	A 3	Pray with him asking God to relieve him of his guilt and heal Jimmy.
	.72	A 5	Tell him that God has his reasons for letting this happen--so he should trust His loving care.
	.70	A 1	Talk with him about God's love and acceptance.
	.43	B 13	Persons need to understand that God does not injure people in order to punish others.

LSP Case 3302: You recieve word that your sister's husband of five years has just been killed instantly in an automobile crash. You liked and respected Dean. He was very good to your sister, but he was an outspoken unbeliever who repeatedly said, "religion is of interest only to little old ladies of both sexes", and considered your decision to enter seminary the waste of a terrific person. When you arrive at your sister's home, the pastor of her congregation has already been there. She is distraught because the pastor told her that Dean has gone to hell; that anyone who has not made a decision for Christ before death is lost. She tells you, "I can't believe that's true. God doesn't really cut people off like that without any hope. I can't believe in a God like that."

3302-4-20	.75	A 8	Remind her of instances in which Dean acted as a Christian.
	.74	A 10	Suggest that Dean may have had more faith in God than he expressed and that one can be a Christian without confessing to an organized religion.
	.65	A 11	Suggest that Dean may have repented before death.
	.43	A 12	God calls persons primarily to love and follow him. Assent to a particular set of beliefs or church membership is secondary.

FORM B (continued)

LSP Case 2106: The 13-year-old daughter of fellow members of your congregation is in the hospital preparatory to having brain surgery tomorrow. She is a member of the Sunday School class you teach; and, though never a very lively child, has always been responsive and pleasant. You go to visit her. When you ask to be directed to her room, one of the nurses smiles and says, "Let me know if you get her to talk." You are told that, though there is nothing physically preventing her from talking, she hasn't spoken since she came into the hospital. When she first catches sight of you, her eyes widen a little, and from then on she just watches you, without responding, either by word or facial expression, to what you do and say.

Case and Factor	Factor Load	Item No.	Item
2106-1-20	.80	A 2	To assure her of God's love for her.
	.79	B 18	Review some of the main things we have learned in Sunday School, and offer words from Scripture that apply to her current concerns.
	.77	B 15	Pray for God's care to surround her.
	.77	B 11	Talk about Jesus' love for children and His healing them.
	.73	A 7	To let her know my prayerful concern.
	.61	A 3	To give her confidence and assurance as she faces surgery; to dispel fear as much as possible.

LSP Case 2109: You attend an inter-church meeting where speakers present both pro- and anti-abortion views. When the group is divided into smaller units for discussion, you meet a middle-aged woman who has recently accepted Christ and become a member of a nearby parish. After the meeting adjourns, the two of you continue to talk. She tells you that several years ago she contracted German measles in the early weeks of a pregnancy, and, on the assumption that the child was damaged, had an abortion. Her newly-sensitized conscience is now giving her considerable trouble over that abortion. She cannot be at rest about the taking of the child's life, and she fears God's anger over it. She says to you, "I just keep going over this and over this in my mind. I can't seem to get it settled for myself. Do you know anything that could help me resolve it?"

2109-3-20	.84	A 3	Remind her that God is not a God of anger but of love, ready to forgive those who repent.
	.77	B 15	Through Christ, God forgives our sins when we repent.
	.72	A 2	Pray with her while she asks God's forgiveness.

APPENDIX C *

Scoring Key for Two of the Five Interview Questions Used to Assess L.S.P. Criterion 35: Personal Faith

Question: 70. What do you think is the main message, above all else, that ministers should convey to their congregations?

Score of 4 = Emphasis on God's action
OR The gospel message
OR God's forgiveness

SAMPLE ANSWERS

(Pause) The main message is the gospel of Jesus Christ. In brief, that in spite of their rebelling against God, God has sent his son to die in their place so that they can be children of his once again.

I guess one of lifestyle, uh, I guess the main message would be that here is a person that may still have doubts and still have questions, and, you know, be as much a saint as a sinner, but at the same time, is, uh, feels freed, feels supported by the gospel and tries to live that out.

(Pause) That they are accepted, they are loved, uh, in eight million ways, and that probably this love comes from God. I guess with that, you can tie in everything of, uh, salvation, atonement in Christ, things like that. But probably just the central message that they are accepted, loved.

The gospel.

Score of 2 = Balances God's action and man's (works) action with about equal strength

SAMPLE ANSWERS

The cross.

Ah, I think a kind of a two-pronged message that their pastor is a human being and that he, like them, ah, operates at the same as a saint and a sinner.

Now what I, it will be what I think, because I'm sure I'm not in agreement with a lot of other people. Ah, God consciousness and sin consciousness is as concise as I can say it.

Well, the main message is always, as far as I'm concerned, is always the same: that people are sinners; that they're separated from God. But there's the way back to God, and that is through faith in Jesus Christ.

Score of 1 = Emphasizes doing; (works) man's action

SAMPLE ANSWERS

I think the, the one main thing perhaps should be that we are members of the body of Christ on earth and, and from that, ah, we can go out and help others, knowing that we have received salvation ourselves. Ah, because we are assured of that, we can go out and we can, ah, help others.

They're members of the body of Christ, and that we are here to serve the purpose which is God's purpose and to get along as a community and to work within the community outside the body also and in a way that's harmonious and loving, I think.

(Pause) Ah, (pause) I would say that, ah, the first commandment: honor your father. And know that God is God. And love others as you love yourself.

* From Brekke, Instrumentation to Assess Readiness for Ministry.

LSP 1/7/76

Cluster 35 - Personal Faith

Question: 75. Some have said that a time set aside each day for prayer and meditation is essential. Others see it as an artificial discipline. What has been your experience?

Score of 4 = Gives evidence that interviewee spends some time every day in private prayer and/or meditation

SAMPLE ANSWERS

I haven't disciplined myself to do it, ah, at the same time everyday, but I certainly do meditate, at least once a day I think.

I find that it's very important for me to take the time to sit down and perhaps read a devotional book. Some people call it a quiet time. I find it's very important. There was a time in my life when I thought that it was unneeded discipline, you know, a waste of time. But lately, I've found that it's very important for me.

Well, my experience has been that it is very helpful everyday to take some quiet time and read the Bible or pray. Or, I think some people, I think maybe even some people aren't, can't do that. I mean, they pray in other ways. And they worship God in other ways. I'm coming to believe that that's okay, too. But I still place a heavy importance on quiet time.

Score of 2 = A time set aside every day for prayer and meditation is a good thing, but no evidence that interviewee does it. May even acknowledge that he/she does not.

SAMPLE ANSWERS

That it's essential.

Can't claim that it's become a discipline with me. It's,ah, a necessary part of life. I, I don't think the discipline's artificial. I think it's a good and healthy thing and I, I guess I wish I could make it part of my life. I haven't at this point.

I think, well, my experience has been that I feel like prayer helps me, it strengthens me, assures me. And I think, well, for me it's helped me a lot. But I wouldn't tell the person who says prayer doesn't help them that they were wrong because if it didn't, well, I can't say that they were wrong, you know, their experiences.

I think it can be very helpful. Essential is too strong of a word. It is, ah, something that can make a very good impact on one's life, though I can identify myself with the difficulty of having, just getting that time.

Score of 1 = Believes it is an artificial discipline
OR I try to practice the presence of God (with feel that it is avoidance of time set aside)
OR I pray as I need to

SAMPLE ANSWERS

I, I find except for a time of sharing with my family, evening, I found it as artificial. I've, ah, I read a book a long time ago about Brother Lawrence who, ah, talked about practicing the presence of God, and I've found that to be more to my liking than a specific morning devotion.

(Pause) I would see it as an artificial discipline. Because my entire life is a prayer. I see prayer as communication from me to God and from God to me. And I can't box that into a closet after school or after work. It's something that happens continuously.

My experience is that it has been an artificial discipline.

Well, often I say to myself, I really should do this. In fact, I've tried several times to do this, like, set aside a certain time, but, but it is an artificial discipline, and it has not been meaningful to me. So, I normally forget it. That's why I mentioned earlier that oftentimes prayer, ah, sort of gets left by the wayside.

I pray when I feel moved to pray, so, ah, therefore, I don't fall into the discipline side nor do I make a habit of it. When I'm so moved to pray, I'll do it, it's my own time, my own freedom of will.

Huh! I've tried both. I think a time in the day somewhat set aside doesn't hurt as long as it doesn't become an artificial situation where you're just praying words, etc., because this is how they do it. It's great if you can honestly come to the Lord every day at a specific time. More important is to have the Lord beside you every minute of the day. And pray any time you feel like praying, regardless of where you're at. This is much more important to me.